17 AUG 24 PM 3: 3 1 GAIL C. TRABISH, ESQ. (#103482) BOORNAZIAN, JENSEN & GARTHE A Professional Corporation 2 555 12th Street, Suite 1800 P. O. Box 12925 3 Oakland, CA 94604-2925 Telephone: (510) 834-4350 Facsimile: (510) 839-1897 5 Attorneys for Defendant TARGET STORES, a division of Target Corporation, erroneously 7 sued herein as Target Corporation 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 JANINE FUJIOKA. 12 Plaintiff, [San Francisco County Superior Court Case No.: CGC-07-465141 13 VINTAGE OAKS SHOPPING CENTER; ANSWER TO UNVERIFIED JAMES CAMPBELL COMPANY, LLC; COMPLAINT TARGET CORPORTION; and DOES 1-50, inclusive, Complaint Filed: July 13, 2007 16 Defendants. 17 COMES NOW Defendant TARGET STORES, a division of Target Corporation, 18 erroneously sued herein as Target Corporation, and for its answer to the complaint of plaintiff 19 20 JANINE FUJIOKA, on file herein, admits, denies and alleges the following: 21 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS 22 1. Answering paragraph 3, this answering defendant states that it has no information 23 or belief concerning the subjects of the allegations therein sufficiently enabling it to answer said 24 paragraph, and on that ground, denies each and every, all and singular, generally and specifically, 25 the allegations contained therein. 26 2. Answering paragraph 5(a) and (c), this answering defendant states that it has no 27 information or belief concerning the subjects of the allegations therein sufficiently enabling it to 28 answer said paragraph, and on that ground, denies each and every, all and singular, generally and

ANSWER TO UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT - [San Francisco County Sup. Ct. Case No.: CGC-07-465141]

Document 3

Filed 08/24/2007

Page 1 of 5

Case 3:07-cv-04393-BZ

specifically, the allegations contained therein. As to paragraph 5(b), this answering defendant admits that Target Stores is a division of Target Corporation, and is a Minnesota corporation whose principal place of business is in Minnesota.

- 3. Answering the allegation in paragraph 6(a), this answering defendant states that it has no information or belief concerning the subjects of the allegations therein sufficient to enable it to answer said paragraph, and on that ground, denies each and every, all and singular, generally and specifically, the allegations contained therein.
- 4. Answering the allegation in paragraph 8(a), this answering defendant denies that the Superior Court of San Francisco is the proper court.
- 5. Answering paragraph 10, this answering defendant admits that there are two (2) causes of action for Premises Liability and General Negligence attached.
- 6. Answering paragraph 11(a), (c), (d) and (f), this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 7. Answering paragraph 14, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION - General Negligence

8. Answering paragraph GN-1, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – Premises Liability

- 9. Answering paragraph Prem. L-1, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 10. Answering paragraph Prem. L-2, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 11. Answering paragraph Prem. L-3, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.
- 12. Answering paragraph Prem. L-4, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

13. Answering paragraph Prem. L-5, this answering defendant denies each and every allegation contained therein.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

This answering defendant demands a jury trial.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

COMES NOW, Defendant TARGET STORES, a division of Target Corporation, erroneously sued herein as Target Corporation, and for its answer to the complaint of plaintiff on file herein alleges as follows:

AS A FIRST, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE VERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that neither the complaint nor any of its alleged causes of action states facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against this answering defendant.

AS A SECOND, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE VERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff failed to mitigate her alleged damages as required by law.

AS A THIRD, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE VERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff was comparatively at fault in the manner and style as set forth in the case of *Li v. Yellow Cab Co.* (1975) 13 Cal.3d 804, and defendant prays that any and all damages sustained by said plaintiff be reduced by the percentage of her negligence.

AS A FOURTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE VERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that the damages complained of, if any there were, were proximately contributed to or caused by the

carelessness, negligence, fault or defects created by the remaining parties in this action, or by other persons, corporations or business entities unknown to this answering defendant at this time, and were not caused in any way by this answering defendant, or by persons for whom this answering defendant is legally liable.

Should this answering defendant be found liable to plaintiff, which liability is expressly denied, said defendant is entitled to have this award against it abated, reduced or eliminated to the extent that the negligence, carelessness, fault or defects created by the remaining parties in this action, or by said other persons, corporations or business entities, contributed to plaintiff's damages, if any.

VERIFIED COMPLAINT ON FILE HEREIN, AND TO EACH CAUSE OF ACTION THEREOF, this answering defendant is informed and believes and thereon alleges that plaintiff knew, or in the exercise of ordinary care should have known, of the risks and hazards involved in the undertaking in which she was engaged, but nevertheless and knowing these things, did freely and voluntarily consent to assume all the risks and hazards involved in the undertaking.

AS A FIFTH, SEPARATE AND DISTINCT AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE TO THE

WHEREFORE, this answering defendant prays as follows:

- That plaintiff take nothing by her complaint and that this answering defendant be 1. dismissed hence;
 - 2. For reasonable attorneys' fees;
 - For costs of suit incurred herein; and 3.
 - For such other and further relief as the Court deems fit and proper. 4.

DATED: August $2 \frac{\cancel{4}}{\cancel{5}}$, 2007

BOORNAZIAN, JENSEN & GARTHE

A Professional Corporation

GAIL C. TRABISH, ESQ.

Attorneys for Defendant TARGET STORES, a division of Target Corporation, erroneously sued herein as Target Corporation

GCT01\412846

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 2

3

5

6

7

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

25

2627

28

<u>CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE</u> (28 U.S.C. §1746)

I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 555 12th Street, Suite 1800, P. O. Box 12925, Oakland, California 94604-2925.

I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. On the date indicated below, at the above-referenced business location, I sealed envelopes, enclosing a copy of the **ANSWER TO UNVERIFIED COMPLAINT**, addressed as shown below, and placed them for collection and mailing following ordinary business practices to be deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below:

Matthew D. Davis, Esq. Doug Saeltzer, Esq. Walkup Melodia Kelly Wecht & Schoenberg 650 California Street, 26th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108 (415) 981-7210 Phone (415) 391-6965 Fax **Attorneys for Plaintiff**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Oakland, California, on August 24, 2007.

Alexine L. Braun

GCT01\412846